

Appl. No. 09/995,004  
Reply to Final OA Dated September 23, 2005

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-78 are pending. No claims have been amended, canceled or withdrawn.

As a preliminary matter, reasons/arguments why US patent number 6,289,382 to Bowman-Amuah does not anticipate claims 1-78 were presented in the June 13, 2005 response to the Office Action dated March 11, 2005. Those arguments are not recited verbatim herein, but are incorporated by reference. The Office is urged to reconsider those arguments in view of the following additional remarks, in view of which withdrawal of the rejections to the pending claims is respectfully requested.

## **Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102(e)**

Claims 1-78 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Bowman-Amuah. This rejection is traversed.

**Claim 1 recites:**

- “detecting a state change to an object in a directory”, and
- “responsive to detecting the state change:”
  - “mapping the state change to the object to a workflow comprising a set of tasks”, and
  - “executing the tasks to achieve a desired state in the directory.”

Bowman-Amuah does not expressly or inherently disclose each of these recited features (as set forth by the claim) for the following reasons.

Appl. No. 09/995,004  
Reply to Final OA Dated September 23, 2005

In addressing claim 1, the Office Action ("Action") asserts that "detecting a state change to an object in a directory", as claim 1 recites, is described by the following: (1) "[a]s data and application logic are split, better control is needed to track processing/data status across locations (col. 117, lines 46-47)"; and (2) "Decisions must be made as to what to route to which role, and win Rule Management Services support the routing of workflow activities by providing the intelligence necessary to determine which rates appropriate given the state of a given process and knowledge of the organizations workflow processing rules (col. 117, lines 2-9)". Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Referring to (1) "[a]s data and application logic are split, better control is needed to track processing/data status across locations (col. 117, lines 46-47)": nowhere does Bowman-Amuah expressly or inherently describe that such "processing/data" is "an object in a directory", as claim 1 recites. Instead, Bowman-Amuah merely indicates that "processing/data status" needs to be tracked "across locations". With respect to what is meant by status tracked "across locations", please refer to the immediately preceding sentence of Bowman-Amuah. Beginning with that sentence Bowman-Amuah states that "work often moves from one processing site to another. As data and application logic are split, better control is needed to track processing/data status across location." In view of this, Applicant respectfully submits that when Bowman-Amuah describes that "better control is needed to track processing/data status across location", Bowman-Amuah is describing that "better control is needed to track processing/data the status from one location/processing site to another. Clearly, this teaching of Bowman-Amuah does not expressly or inherently describe "detecting a state change to an object in a directory", as claim 1 recites.

Appl. No. 09/995,004  
Reply to Final OA Dated September 23, 2005

1        In view of the above, the other portion of Bowman-Amuah relied on by the  
2 Action (i.e., column 117, lines 2-11 -- “[d]ecisions must be made as to what to  
3 route to which role, and win Rule Management Services support the routing of  
4 workflow activities by providing the intelligence necessary to determine which  
5 routes are appropriate given the state of a given process and knowledge of the  
6 organizations workflow processing rules”) does not expressly or inherently  
7 describe doing anything “responsive to detecting the state change”, as claim 1  
8 recites. This is because the claimed “state change” is a “state change to an object  
9 in a directory”, and not status of processing/data that has been tracked across  
10 locations/process sites, as Bowman-Amuah describes.

11       Furthermore, for each of the above reasons, the additional description relied  
12 on by the Action in support of the anticipation rejection of claim 1 (i.e., Bowman-  
13 Amuah at column 117, lines 24-37), which describes areas for workflow  
14 application monitoring such as employee productivity, process performance, and  
15 forecasting/scheduling, use of status reports to assist in performance monitoring  
16 does not expressly or inherently describe “responsive to detecting the state change:  
17 mapping the state change to the object to a workflow comprising a set of tasks”,  
18 and “executing the tasks to achieve a desired state in the directory”, as claim 1  
19 recites. This is especially the case because the claimed “state change” is a “state  
20 change to an object in a directory”, and not status of processing/data that has been  
21 tracked across locations/process sites, as Bowman-Amuah describes.

22       For at least each of the above reasons, the cited portions of Bowman-  
23 Amuah, and Bowman-Amuah, as a whole are completely silent with respect to any  
24 explicit or inherent description of “detecting a state change to an object in a  
25 directory”, and “responsive to detecting the state change: mapping the state change

Appl. No. 09/995,004  
Reply to Final OA Dated September 23, 2005

1 to the object to a workflow comprising a set of tasks", and "executing the tasks to  
2 achieve a desired state in the directory", as claim 1 recites. Since Bowman-  
3 Amuah does not describe each and every element as set forth in claim 1, Bowman-  
4 Amuah cannot anticipate claim 1.

5 Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claim 1 is  
6 respectfully requested.

7 **Claims 2-18** depend from claim 1 and are not anticipated by Bowman-  
8 Amuah solely by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, and for this reason  
9 alone, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claims 2-18 is improper and should be  
10 withdrawn.

11 Moreover, claims 2-18 include additional features that are not anticipated  
12 by Bowman-Amuah. For example, claims 3, 7, 11, 12, 15, 17, and 18 recite  
13 features that for the reasons already discussed above and in the previous response  
14 are not anticipate by Bowman-Amuah. For those additional reasons, the 35 USC  
15 102(e) rejections of claims 3, 7, 11, 12, 15, 17, and 18 as anticipated by Bowman-  
16 Amuah should be withdrawn.

17 Additionally, for example, claim 10 recites "wherein mapping the state  
18 change to the object, semantics of the mapping are based on an event association  
19 object schema." In addressing these claimed features, the Action at section 27  
20 asserts that they are described by Bowman-Amuah at column 147, lines 13-18.  
21 Applicant disagrees. Bowman-Amuah at column 147, lines 13-18 explicitly  
22 describes:

23 *"It's often said that, a good manager can manage anything. Many  
24 management skills such as planning, monitoring status, working  
with end- customer expectations, and managing risk certainly apply  
25 to any domain. These blocking-and-tackling aspects of management*

Appl. No. 09/995,004  
Reply to Final OA Dated September 23, 2005

1                   *must not be forgotten on a component-based development project.*  
2                   *Managers may, at times, be intimidated by component experts, and*  
3                   *ignore the basics of project management.”*

4                   Clearly, the cited section of Bowman-Amuah is completely silent with respect to  
5                   any description of the recited features of claim 10. Anticipation of claimed  
6                   features cannot be supported by mere probabilities are possibilities. Rather, a  
7                   single reference must expressly or inherently describe each of the claimed features  
8                   as set forth by the claim. The cited section of Bowman-Amuah, and Bowman-  
9                   Amuah as a whole, plainly does not anticipate the features of claim 10.

10                  Accordingly, for these additional reasons, withdrawal of the 35 USC  
11                  §102(e) rejection of claim 10 is respectfully requested.

12                  In another example, claim 13 recites “monitoring a status corresponding to  
13                  a task of the tasks”, “storing the status on a status monitoring object”, and  
14                  “wherein a content class in the directory schema defines the status-monitoring  
15                  object.” In addressing these claimed features, the Action at section 27 asserts that  
16                  they are described by Bowman-Amuah at column 147, lines 13-18. Applicant  
17                  disagrees. Bowman-Amuah at column 147, lines 13-18 explicitly describes:

18                  *“It's often said that, a good manager can manage anything. Many*  
19                  *management skills such as planning, monitoring status, working*  
20                  *with end- customer expectations, and managing risk certainly apply*  
21                  *to any domain. These blocking-and-tackling aspects of management*  
22                  *must not be forgotten on a component-based development project.*  
23                  *Managers may, at times, be intimidated by component experts, and*  
24                  *ignore the basics of project management”.*

25                  Clearly, the cited section of Bowman-Amuah is completely silent with respect to  
26                  any description of the recited features of claim 13. Anticipation of claimed  
27                  features cannot be supported by mere probabilities are possibilities. Rather, a

Appl. No. 09/995,004  
Reply to Final OA Dated September 23, 2005

1 single reference must expressly or inherently describe each of the claimed features  
2 as set forth by the claim. The cited section of Bowman-Amuah, and Bowman-  
3 Amuah as a whole, plainly does not anticipate the features of claim 13.

4 Accordingly, for these additional reasons, withdrawal of the 35 USC  
5 §102(e) rejection of claim 13 is respectfully requested.

6 In another example, claim 14 recites “monitoring a set of directory  
7 resources affected by the workflow”, “storing the directory resources on a status  
8 monitoring object”, and “wherein a content class in the directory schema defines  
9 the status-monitoring object.” In addressing these claimed features, the Action at  
10 section 27 asserts that they are described by Bowman-Amuah at column 147, lines  
11 13-18. Applicant disagrees. Bowman-Amuah at column 147, lines 13-18  
12 explicitly describes:

13 “*It's often said that, a good manager can manage anything. Many*  
14 *management skills such as planning, monitoring status, working*  
15 *with end- customer expectations, and managing risk certainly apply*  
16 *to any domain. These blocking-and-tackling aspects of management*  
17 *must not be forgotten on a component-based development project.*  
18 *Managers may, at times, be intimidated by component experts, and*  
19 *ignore the basics of project management”.*

20 Clearly, the cited section of Bowman-Amuah is completely silent with respect to  
21 any description of the recited features of claim 14. Anticipation of claimed  
22 features cannot be supported by mere probabilities are possibilities. Rather, a  
23 single reference must expressly or inherently describe each of the claimed features  
24 as set forth by the claim. The cited section of Bowman-Amuah, and Bowman-  
25 Amuah as a whole, plainly does not anticipate the features of claim 14.

26 Accordingly, for these additional reasons, withdrawal of the 35 USC  
27 §102(e) rejection of claim 14 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/995,004  
Reply to Final OA Dated September 23, 2005

1       **Claim 19** recites "detecting a state change to an object in a directory", and  
2 "responsive to detecting the state change: mapping the state change to the object to  
3 a workflow comprising a set of tasks", and "executing the tasks to achieve a  
4 desired state in the directory." For the reasons already discussed above with  
5 respect to claim 1, Bowman-Amuah does not anticipate these claimed features.

6       Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 19 as anticipated by  
7 Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

8       **Claims 20-36** depend from claim 19 and are allowable over Bowman-  
9 Amuah solely by virtue of this dependency.

10      Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claims 20-36 as anticipated by  
11 Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

12      Moreover, claims 20-36 include additional features that are not anticipated  
13 by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons already discussed above and in the previous  
14 response. For those additional reasons, the 35 USC 102(e) rejections of claims 20-  
15 36 as anticipated by Bowman-Amuah should be withdrawn.

16      **Claim 37** recites "detecting a state change to an object in a directory", and  
17 "responsive to detecting the state change: mapping the state change to the object to  
18 a workflow comprising a set of tasks", and "executing the tasks to achieve a  
19 desired state in the directory." For the reasons already discussed above with  
20 respect to claim 1, Bowman-Amuah does not anticipate these claimed features.

21      Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 37 as anticipated by  
22 Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

23      **Claims 38-54** depend from claim 37 and are allowable over Bowman-  
24 Amuah solely by virtue of this dependency.

Appl. No. 09/995,004  
Reply to Final OA Dated September 23, 2005

1        Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claims 38-54 as anticipated by  
2 Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

3        Moreover, claims 38-54 include additional features that are not anticipated  
4 by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons already discussed above and in the previous  
5 response. For those additional reasons, the 35 USC 102(e) rejections of claims 38-  
6 54 as anticipated by Bowman-Amuah should be withdrawn.

7        **Claim 55** recites "detecting a state change to an object in a directory", and  
8 "responsive to detecting the state change: mapping the state change to the object to  
9 a workflow comprising a set of tasks", and "executing the tasks to achieve a  
10 desired state in the directory." For the reasons already discussed above with  
11 respect to claim 1, Bowman-Amuah does not anticipate these recited features of  
12 claim 55.

13        Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 55 as anticipated by  
14 Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

15        **Claims 56-72** depend from claim 55 and are allowable over Bowman-  
16 Amuah solely by virtue of this dependency.

17        Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claims 56-72 as anticipated by  
18 Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

19        Moreover, claims 56-72 include additional features that are not anticipated  
20 by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons already discussed above and in the previous  
21 response. For those additional reasons, the 35 USC 102(e) rejections of claims 56-  
22 72 as anticipated by Bowman-Amuah should be withdrawn.

23        **Claim 73** is directed to "[a] workflow enabled directory schema comprising  
24 a plurality of base object content classes" that include "a provisioning service  
25 content class to detect an event corresponding to a state change in a directory

Appl. No. 09/995,004  
Reply to Final OA Dated September 23, 2005

1 object", "a workflow content class for storing a sequence of tasks", "an event  
2 association content class for storing declarative conditions to map the state change  
3 to the directory object to an object instance of the workflow content class", and  
4 "wherein the provisioning service content class is further configured to execute the  
5 sequence of tasks corresponding to the object instance." Reasons why these  
6 recited features were not anticipated to by Bowman-Amuah were already  
7 discussed above and in the previous response, which is not repeated verbatim  
8 herein. For those additional reasons, the 35USC 102(e) rejection of claim 73 as  
9 anticipated by Bowman-Amuah should be withdrawn.

10 **Claims 74-76** depend from claim 73 and are not anticipated by Bowman-  
11 Amuah at least four reasons of this dependency. Accordingly, withdrawal of the  
12 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 74-76 is respectfully requested. Additionally,  
13 for the reasons already discussed above and in the previous office action, reasons  
14 which are not repeated verbatim herein, claims 74 and 76 include additional  
15 features that are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah. For these additional reasons,  
16 withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 74 and 76 is respectfully  
17 requested.

18  
19 **Conclusion**

20 Pending claims 1-78 are in condition for allowance and action to that end is  
21 respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the  
22 application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance  
23 of an advisory action.

Appl. No. 09/995,004  
Reply to Final OA Dated September 23, 2005

1 | Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 11/23/2005

By: Brian Hart  
Brian G. Hart  
Reg. No. 44, 421  
(509) 324-9256

卷之三